Remarks

Claims 1, 3, 5-6, 8-11, 15 and 17-23 are pending.

1. <u>The web client automatically transmitting cookie request to the remote computer and the web client receiving a second cookie from the web server (amended Claims 1 and 21)</u>.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claims 2 and 4. Accordingly, Claims 2 and 4 have been canceled. Claim 1 now recites: the WEB client, in response to receiving user input defining a URL, automatically transmitting a request to the remote computer for a cookie that is valid for the URL; then later, the WEB client receiving a second cookie from the WEB server; and in response to receiving the second cookie, the WEB client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage. Claim 21 is a computer readable medium counterpart to method Claim 1 and recites similar limitations.

<u>Web client automatically transmitting cookie request</u>. The Examiner asserts without explanation that Narin col. 9, lines 51-57 teaches the web client automatically transmitting a cookie request in response to receiving user input defining a URL, as claimed. Office Action page 3 (regarding Claim 2). This assertion is not correct. The cited passage in Narin is quoted below.

> For example, when a user requests content from a given content provider (e.g. a request for a Web page from a Web site), for the first time, a cookie associated with that content, consisting of electronic data in the form of a file header is transmitted to the client computer 20a from the content provider's server computer 10a.

Narin teaches the conventional procedure in which a user requests a web page from a web site and, in response, the web server automatically transmits a cookie to the web client along with the web page. Even assuming the user request for a web page in Narin includes the web client receiving user input defining a URL, as claimed, Narin's web client does not thereafter automatically request a cookie and it does not request anything from a remote computer that is not the web server. Rather, Narin's web client

(apparently) automatically requests the web page from the web site/server in response to receiving user input.

Narin's web client automatically requesting *something else* from *somewhere else* does not make obvious a web client automatically requesting a cookie from Sears' cookie server. The Examiner's unexplained assertion to the contrary is not correct.

Web client receiving a second cookie. The Examiner asserts without explanation that Narin col. 11, line 66 through col. 12, line 10 teaches the web client receiving a second cookie and transmitting the second cookie, as claimed. This assertion is not correct. The cited passage in Narin is quoted below.

> If client computer 20a has not been to content provider's server 10a or 10a' before, content provider's server 10a and 10a' create cookies 110'(b)(1) and 110'(b)(2), respectively, and populates cookies 110'(b)(1) and 110'b(2) to store general information about client computer's requests. Created cookies 110'(b)(1) and 110'(b)(2) are transmitted with the desired content to client computer 20a. Client computer 20a, in turn, passes cookies 110'(b)(1) and 110'b(2) to the browser processing and storage space 180a of computing application browser 180. The created cookie is now ready for use with future requests for content by client computer 20a.

This passage in Narin stands for the unremarkable proposition that if a web client requests content from two different web sites, the web sites will each return a cookie to the web client along with the requested content.

In the method of Claim 1, by contrast, the two cookies relate to the same URL: the WEB client receiving a first cookie from the remote computer, the WEB client transmitting the first cookie valid for the URL and a request for the resource to the WEB Server, the WEB client receiving the resource and a second cookie from the WEB server, and the WEB client transmitting the second cookie to the remote computer for storage. In any event, Narin does not teach the web client transmitting the second cookie (or any other cookie) to a computer remote from the web client (the "computing application browser 180" in Narin resides on the web clients). The Examiner's unexplained assertions to the contrary are not correct.

For all of these reasons, Sears and Narin do not teach the combination of elements recited in amended Claims 1 and 21, as required to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

2. <u>Receiving the cookie from the web client (Claims 6, 15, 22 and 23)</u>.

The computing device of Claim 6 includes a means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL's from a first WEB client. In the system of Claim 15, the remote computer is operable to receive cookies from first and second web clients. Computer readable medium counterpart Claims 22 and 23 recite similar limitations. The Examiner asserts without explanation that Sears and Narin teach a remote computer receiving a cookie from a web client. This assertion is not correct.

In Narin, the web client receives cookies from the web server. E.g., Narin column 9, lines 51-57. (There is no remote computer in Narin.) In Sears, the cookie server receives the cookies from the web servers, not from the web clients (or builds the cookies based on information from the web servers). Sears column 2, lines 35-38 and claim 1 (storing and registering elements). No where does Sears teach receiving a cookie from a web client. If the Examiner disagrees, she is respectfully requested to specifically point out and explain those passages in Sears that teach this element. Absent such a showing, the rejections of Claims 6, 15, 22 and 23 (and any respective dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

The foregoing is believed to be a complete response to the pending Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven R. Ormiston/

Steven R. Ormiston
Reg. No. 35,974
Phone: 208-433-1991 x204